

MAR 08 2007

Application No.: 09/881,513

12

Docket No.: 495142000100

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 and 20-41 stand rejected in the present Office Action. In this response, claims 1-4, 7-23, 26, and 36-44 are canceled without prejudice, and claims 5-6, 24-25, and 34-35 are amended. Accordingly, claims 5-6, 24-25, and 27-35 are pending in the present application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and reasons.

35 USC 112 rejection

In Sections 2-5 of the Office Action, claims 1-12 and 20-41 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 1-4, 7-12, 20-23, 26, and 36-41 are canceled without prejudice. Claims 5-6, 24-25, and 34-35 are amended to no longer recite the limitation "wherein the second content is provided to the first computer independent of a display size of the first computer." It is unclear what the basis of rejection is for claims 27-33.

35 USC 102 rejection of claims 1-4, 7-8, 10, 20-22, and 36-38

In Sections 6-19 of the Office Action, claims 1-4, 7-8, 10, 20-22, and 36-38 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,300,947 (Kanevsky).

Claims 1-4, 7-8, 10, 20-22, and 36-38 are canceled without prejudice.

35 USC 103 rejection of claims 5-6, 9, 11-12, 24-25, 34-35, and 39-41

In Sections 20-33 of the Office Action, claims 5-6, 9, 11-12, 24-25, 34-35, and 39-41 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,092,191 (Shimbo).

Claims 9, 11-12, and 39-41 are canceled without prejudice. Each of claims 5-6 and 24-25 is rewritten into independent claims.

Application No.: 09/881,513

13

Docket No.: 495142000100

For claim 5, the Examiner states that Kanevsky does not teach the limitations relating to searching for a pre-determined rule for insertion using the IP address information but that Shimbo discloses such limitations. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 5 recites that "if the IP address information does not match pre-determined IP address information to which a rule for insertion might apply, forwarding the requested content to the first computer . . ." (emphasis added).

In contrast, Shimbo discloses transmitting a received packet to its destination only if there is a match in the authentication key attached to the packet with authentication keys provided in a security gateway through which the packet passes. An authentication key is generated for "each set of a source host address, a destination host address, and a connection ID. Each of these authentication keys for proof is shared with a respective security gateway through which the packet passes." "At the security gateway . . . , the authentication code . . . is inspected . . . and when no abnormality is detected by this inspection, . . . the packet transfer is completed by transferring the packet . . ." Otherwise, the packet is not transferred. See col. 20, line 64-col. 22, line 39.

Furthermore, there is insufficient motivation to combine Shimbo with Kanevsky. Shimbo is directed to a "packet authentication scheme for a security gateway which authenticates whether a received packet is from a proper computer/user or not in order to transfer only proper packets, and a packet packet encryption/decryption scheme for a security gateway which encrypts/decrypts packets in order to prevent the information leakage in a data transfer to an external organization." Col. 1, lines 8-14. Shimbo is directed to controlling packet movement in order to prevent unknown content from entering a network and/or leaving a network. Kanevsky is directed to adjusting content provided at a user device relative to the content provided by a source in accordance with the display size of the user device. Thus, Kanevsky's adjustment of source content introduces unknown content which would be rejected and considered undesirable in Shimbo's system.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 5 is allowable over Kanevsky and Shimbo, alone or in combination. It is also respectfully submitted that claims 6, 24, 25, 34, and 35

Application No.: 09/881,513

14

Docket No.: 495142000100

are also allowable over Kanevsky and Shimbo, alone or in combination, for similar reasons as discussed above.

35 USC 103 rejection of claim 26

In Sections 34-35 of the Office Action, claim 26 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,647,388 (Numao).

Claim 26 is canceled without prejudice.

35 USC 103 rejection of claims 27-33

In Sections 36-49 of the Office Action, claims 27-33 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,421,733 (Tso).

The Examiner states that the elements "receiving in the intermediate computer a first request . . .," "receiving in the intermediate computer a re-request from the first content . . .," and "sending the re-request for the first content . . ." are not disclosed in Kanevsky but are taught by Tso. Applicants respectfully disagree. Tso has not been considered "in its entirety, i.e., as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention." MPEP 2141.03.

Tso discloses a HTTP request originating at the network client 12 being transmitted to transcoding server 34 and/or Internet 18 depending on whether the requested content is already cached, and for receiving the requested content from the most "local" cache (and not necessarily from the Internet 18). When the requested content is already cached in a cache memory 56 of the network client 12, this cached content is passed to browser 32 for rendering. When the requested content is not cached in the cache memory 56 of the network client 12, then the HTTP request is transmitted to the transcoding server 34. If a cache memory 30 of the transcoding server 34 has the requested content, then the transcoding server 34 provides the content to the network client 12. Otherwise, if the cache memory 56 of the network client 12 nor the cache memory 30 of the transcoding server 34 has the requested content, then the HTTP request is transmitted to the Internet 18, and the Internet 18 provides the content to the network client 12 via the transcoding server 34. See col. 13, line 36-col. 14, line 63; Figures 5, 7-9.

sf-2195076

Application No.: 09/881,513

15

Docket No.: 495142000100

In contrast, claim 27 recites that the first content is re-requested from the first computer to the intermediate computer after delivery of the second content to the first computer. Tso does not disclose providing a second content, which is not even content that is requested by the user. Tso does not disclose re-requesting its original HTTP request from the network client 12 to the transcoding server 34 after receiving content. Claim 27 also recites that the connection between the second computer and the intermediate computer is established in response to the re-request for the first content from the first computer. Tso does not disclose establishing a connection between the transcoding server 34 and the Internet 18 because the network client 12 sent a re-request for the original HTTP request. Tso establishes connection between the transcoding server 34 and the Internet 18 from the original HTTP request and because the requested content is not cached in neither the network client 12 nor the transcoding server 34.

Thus, Tso considered as a whole, does not establish a connection with the Internet 18 because the user requested content already exists in a local cache (either at the network client 12 or transcoding server 34), not because Tso wants to provide non-requested content to the user before providing the requested content. Tso fails to disclose the user's computer sending a re-request for the same original requested content because Tso's system is configured to provide the requested content in response to the original request instead of providing non-requested content.

Moreover, there is insufficient motivation to combine Tso with Kanevsky. The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to "combine Tso with Kanevsky because utilizing a proxy cache system enables a user to have quicker access to HTTP documents for frequent use as opposed to continually accessing web servers for content that is frequently requested. Not having a cache system could add latency to a system." However, claim 27 recites functionalities that are opposite to providing quicker access to requested content. Claim 27 recites providing second content in response to a request for first content. Claim 27 recites that the first content is provided after the second content is provided and after the user's computer has re-requested the first content. Even if Tso teaches the benefit of reducing system latency by using a proxy cache system for frequently used HTTP documents, Kanevsky is directed to adjusting content provided at a user device relative to the content provided by a source in accordance with the display size of the user

MAR 08 2007

Application No.: 09/881,513

16

Docket No.: 495142000100

device. Maximizing use of cache systems or reducing system latencies is not a priority for Kanevsky.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 27 is allowable over Kanevsky and Tso, alone or in combination. Claim 30 is also allowable over Kanevsky and Tso, alone or in combination, for similar reasons as discussed above. Claims 28-29 and 31-33, which depend from one of claims 27 and 30, are also allowable over Kanevsky and Tso, alone or in combination, for at least the same reasons as for claims 27 and 30.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 495142000100. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: March 8, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Katherine D. Lee

Registration No.: 44,865

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

425 Market Street

San Francisco, California 94105-2482

(415) 268-6982